UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,989	11/14/2003	Hiroshi Masuno	Q78463	7370
SUGHRUE, M	7590 09/25/200 ION, ZINN,	EXAMINER		
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			SCHNURR, JOHN R	
Washington, D	nia Avenue, N.W. C 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<i>C</i> ,			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,989	MASUNO, HIROSHI	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN R. SCHNURR	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 Jules</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange.	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the B		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		· <i>'</i>	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Oπice	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te	

Art Unit: 2623

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/02/2008 has been entered.

DETAILED ACTION

- 2. Claims 1-23 are pending and have been examined.
- 3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/21/2008 was considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imaeda (US Patent 5,969,749).

Consider **claim 1**, Imaeda clearly teaches an information communication terminal with a TV telephone function, **(Fig. 7)** comprising:

Art Unit: 2623

a display data generating section which generates first display data in a general use mode in which a TV telephone function is not used; (TV reception 60 provides video data when there is no telephone communication, col. 6 lines 54-66.)

a TV telephone processing section which generates second display data in a TV telephone use mode in which the TV telephone function is used; (Video decoding circuit 36 decodes video received from the communication partner, col. 3 lines 20-21.)

a display unit which displays inputted display data; (Monitor 20)

a first switch provided among said display data generating section, said TV telephone processing section and said display unit; (Switch 64)

a control section which controls said first switch to connect said display data generating section and said display unit in said general use mode such that said first display data is supplied to said display unit and to connect said TV telephone processing section and said display unit in said TV telephone use mode such that said second display data is supplied to said display unit, (Switch 64 is controlled by communication control circuit 72 to select either TV reception circuit 60 in a first mode or video decoding circuit 36 in a communication mode, col. 3 lines 24-48 and col. 6 lines 35-66.)

wherein the TV telephone use mode is enabled when image data is transmitted and received together with a communication sound, (Fig. 2: The communication mode is enabled when a call is received, col. 4 lines 24-45.) and the second display data includes a motion image which is always displayed when the TV telephone mode is enabled. (Switch 64 supplies the communication signal to the monitor 20 until the communication ends, col. 6 lines 59-66.)

Consider claim 18, Imaeda clearly teaches the first switch is a cross-over switch connecting said display data generating section and said display unit in said general use mode and connecting said TV telephone processing section and said display unit in said TV telephone use mode. (Fig. 7 Switch 64 connects either TV reception circuit 60 or video decoding circuit 36 to monitor 20, col. 6 lines 38-42.)

Consider **claim 19**, Imaeda clearly teaches the first switch provides a direct path from said display data generating section to said display unit in said general use mode and the first switch provides a direct path from said TV telephone

Art Unit: 2623

processing section to said display unit in said TV telephone use mode. (col. 6 lines 38-42)

Consider claim 20, Imaeda clearly teaches the general use mode is enabled when image data is not transmitted and received together with the communication sound. (When not in communication mode the system displays TV data, col. 6 lines 59-66.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 2, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaeda (US Patent 5,969,749) in view of Sawachi (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0011704).

Consider **claim 2**, Imaeda clearly teaches a communication terminal with a TV telephone function.

However, Imaeda does not explicitly teach a power source; and a second switch provided between said TV telephone processing section and said power source, wherein said control section controls said second switch to disconnect said power source from said TV telephone processing section in said general use mode and to connect said power source from said TV telephone processing section in said TV telephone use mode.

In an analogous art, Sawachi, which discloses a system for interfacing a digital camera and a mobile phone, clearly teaches a switch placed between a power supply and digital signal processing circuitry to interrupt power when the circuitry is not being used. (Fig. 4: SW17 prevents power consumption by DSP unit 102, [0059].)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Imaeda by disconnecting power from the video processing section when it is not in use, as taught by

Application/Control Number: 10/706,989

Art Unit: 2623

Sawachi, for the benefit of reducing the power consumed by the device (see [0006]-[0022] Sawachi).

Consider **claim 14**, Imaeda combined with Sawachi, as in claim 2, clearly teaches said second switch is automatically switched in conjunction with said first switch in response to a selected mode, wherein said selected mode is said general use mode or said TV telephone use mode. **([0059] and [0071] Sawachi)**

Page 5

Consider claim 21, see claim 18.

Consider claim 22, see claim 19.

Consider claim 23, see claim 14.

9. Claims 3-5, 7-10, 13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaeda (US Patent 5,969,749) in view of Fernandez et al. (US Patent 6,339,842), herein Fernandez.

Consider **claim 3**, Imaeda clearly teaches said TV telephone processing section comprises:

a first input circuit connected to said display data generating section, wherein said first input circuit receives said first display data from said display data generating section, carries out a first converting process to said first display data to generate converted display data; (TV reception circuit 60 receives and converts the TV data to displayable form, col. 6 lines 36-42.)

a motion picture CODEC circuit which receives compressed motion picture data from a counter end, expands said received compressed motion picture data into expanded motion picture display data; (Video decoding circuit 36 decodes video received from the communication partner, col. 3 lines 20-21.)

a camera; (Fig. 7 Camera 12)

a second input circuit connected to said camera, wherein said second input circuit receives motion picture display data from said camera, carries out a second converting process to said motion picture display data to generate converted motion picture display data, and to store in said first memory; (The video data from camera 12 is encoded in video encoding circuit 32, col. 3 lines 15-18.)

Art Unit: 2623

a combining circuit which reads out said converted display data and said expanded motion picture display data to combine into said second display data, and outputs said second display data to said first switch. (Fig, 8: Image synthesis circuit 50 receives TV reception data and the video image of the communication partner and combines the images, col. 6 lines 20-33 and col. 7 lines 41-50.)

However, Imaeda does not explicitly teach a first memory storing said converted display data, said expanded motion picture display data and said converted motion picture display data, and synthesizing all three inputs onto the same display screen.

In an analogous art, Fernandez, which discloses a TV telephone system, clearly teaches a first memory storing said converted display data, said expanded motion picture display data and said converted motion picture display data, and synthesizing all three inputs onto the same display screen. (Fig. 4: Images from a program 52 and participants 56, including the local participant are buffered and displayed on display 50, col. 3 lines 36-49.)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Imaeda by buffering and displaying images of the received TV data, the communication partner and the local user, as taught by Fernandez, for the benefit of providing subscriber conferencing during program delivery (col. 1 lines 24-30 Fernandez).

Consider **claim 4**, Imaeda combined with Fernandez, as in claim 3, clearly teaches said motion picture CODEC circuit reads out said converted motion picture display data from said first memory, and compresses said converted motion picture display data into transmission motion picture data, and said information communication terminal further comprises: a communication circuit which transmits said transmission motion picture data to said counter end. **(col. 3 lines 15-23 lmaeda)**

Consider claim 5, Imaeda combined with Fernandez, as in claim 3, clearly teaches said display unit has a third input circuit which receives said first display data as said inputted display data, said first input circuit achieves a same function as that of said third input circuit. (Fig. 8: The selecting switch 80 includes input b, which is the output of TV reception circuit, col. 8 lines 2-4 lmaeda.)

Consider **claim 7**, Imaeda clearly teaches the system of claim 1.

However, Imaeda does not explicitly teach the device is a mobile phone.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,989

Art Unit: 2623

In an analogous art, Fernandez, which discloses a TV telephone system, clearly teaches the subscriber unit is a mobile phone. (Fig. 1: col. 1 lines 48-50)

Page 7

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Imaeda by using a mobile phone, as taught by Fernandez, for the benefit of enabling mobile communication.

Consider claim 8, see claim 2. Consider claim 9, see claim 3. Consider claim 10, see claim 4.

Consider claim 13, Imaeda clearly teaches generating said second display data.

However, Imaeda does not explicitly teach said control section controls said first switch to connect said TV telephone processing section and said display unit in said imaging use mode such that said second display data is supplied to said display unit.

In an analogous art, Fernandez, which discloses a TV telephone system, clearly teaches said control section controls said first switch to connect said TV telephone processing section and said display unit in said imaging use mode such that said second display data is supplied to said display unit.

(Fig. 4: Images from a program 52 and participants 56, including the local participant are buffered and displayed on display 50, col. 3 lines 36-49.)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Imaeda by using a mobile phone, as taught by Fernandez, for the benefit of providing subscriber conferencing during program delivery (col. 1 lines 24-30 Fernandez).

Consider claim 16, see claim 13. Consider claim 17, see claim 14.

10. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaeda (US Patent 5,969,749) in view of Fernandez et al. (US Patent 6,339,842) further in view of Allen et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0041333), herein Allen.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,989

Art Unit: 2623

Consider **claim 6**, Imaeda combined with Fernandez, as in claim 3, clearly teaches the processing and storage of received motion picture data and locally recorded data.

Page 8

However, Imaeda combined with Fernandez does not explicitly teach a second memory for storage of the processed received motion picture data and locally recorded data.

In an analogous art, Allen, which discloses a TV telephone system, clearly teaches a memory for storage of the processed received motion picture data and locally recorded data. ([0082])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Imaeda combined with Fernandez by recording the processed received motion picture data and locally recorded data in a second memory, as taught by Allen, for the benefit of keeping a record of video communications.

Consider claim 11, see claim 6.

11. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaeda

(US Patent 5,969,749) in view of Yap et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0043260), herein Yap.

Consider **claim 12**, Imaeda clearly teaches a TV telephone system with user interaction.

However, Imaeda does not explicitly teach said first display data is a user interface display data which comprises at least one of operation menus, telephone numbers, e-mail data, browser display data, battery level, and radio wave strength data.

In an analogous art, Yap, which discloses a videophone system, clearly teaches a user interface display data which comprises at least one of operation menus, telephone numbers, e-mail data, browser display data, battery level, and radio wave strength data. (Fig. 11 [0134])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Imaeda by displaying user interface display data which comprises at least one of operation menus, telephone numbers, e-mail data, browser display data, battery level, and radio

Art Unit: 2623

wave strength data, as taught by Yap, for the benefit of enabling user interaction with the device.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imaeda (US Patent 5,969,749) in view of Fernandez et al. (US Patent 6,339,842) in view of Yap et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0043260).

Consider claim 15, see claim 12.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN R. SCHNURR whose telephone number is (571)270-1458. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRS

/Christopher Grant/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623